

## VII. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DATA RECOVERED

### A. INTRODUCTION

Interpreting a site with somewhat mixed contexts such as the Drawyer Creek South Site (7NC-G-143) entails the difficult task of trying to separate the various occupations according to meaningful groups of artifacts for analysis. Although the Drawyer Creek South Site was unplowed, thereby minimizing mixing within the upper cultural horizon, there was little separation between the succession of occupations on the site. Most of the occupations were within or adjacent to the eluvial E-horizon, between 20 and 50 centimeters below surface.

Interpretation of the site's components is based on the distribution of discrete clusters of debitage and associated diagnostic artifacts and the distribution of raw material types. What has been learned about the two components, the upper and the lower, which appear to be inextricably joined in Level 3, is summarized in this chapter. It is likely that a number of other occupations, of a very transitory nature, are present on the site which can never be expected to be seen or interpreted clearly. Many brief visits to the site undoubtedly occurred, lasting perhaps a few hours to a few days, leaving behind a small number of identifiable pottery sherds or one or two projectile points.

Although the Drawyer Creek South Site was tentatively identified as a Woodland II procurement site following the Phase II investigations, it is still difficult to determine exactly what the site inhabitants were procuring, besides lithic raw material from nearby stream cobbles. The botanical evidence consists of little more than a few nuts and seeds, and there is no evidence of faunal material, including shellfish, in this estuarine setting. The absence of obvious local lithic resources is probably unimportant, as secondary source (cobble) lithic raw material acquisition most likely followed very systematic and highly successful methods from site to site.

### B. A SEQUENCE OF SITE VIEWS

The sequence discussed here describes the Drawyer Creek South Site as it may have appeared shortly after each of its occupations. The earliest site visit appears to have begun near the time when an estuarine or tidal environment was just forming adjacent to the site location. Prior to that time, a freshwater creek environment surrounded by wetlands would have prevailed in the creek environs near Drawyer Creek.

If one were looking at the site from the edge of the creek bank shortly after the time of its earliest occupation, i.e., circa 1000 BC, one would see only a few small scatters of lithic debris and steatite vessel sherds. A very small tool-making area, defined by a small number of rhyolite flakes, would be evident in a high position overlooking the creek (Block Area 4). The lack of tools discarded in this area perhaps indicates that only a few resharpening efforts or limited tool manufacturing occurred on the site during a very brief stay. A steatite sherd recovered a short distance (15 meters) downslope may be evidence of the same visit, or at least a contemporary occupation of the site. Most of the early occupation, however, appears to have been too brief to have left behind any substantial remains.

Again looking from the creek edge and facing upslope, many centuries later, circa AD 700, one area of occupation on the right and halfway up the slope would be seen to contain debris, including a few sherds of thick quartz-tempered ceramics (Woodland I), perhaps the remains of a short-term camp. It would not have been the first time this area was occupied, as other sherds, representing an earlier period (Early Woodland/Marcey Creek), would also have been evident here. Aside from the domestic (i.e., food preparation) function of this collection, as indicated by the ceramics, lithic workshop debris would also have been apparent, including jasper and quartzite debitage and a discarded hammerstone. The focus of the lithic workshop activities appears to have been core reduction and bifacial tool reduction.

Most of the other areas along the gently sloping surface where lithic debris is scattered contain very few flakes or ceramics in any concentrations. Very few tools are visible either, although one primary concentration of note (Block Area 3 Center) shows the results of multi-stage biface reduction activity.

The final view of the site after its abandonment circa AD 1200, again observing the occupation area from the creek bank facing uphill, would take in a hearth to the right, surrounded by debris from lithic workshop activity (Block Area 1). Both early-stage reduction and late-stage biface reduction are evident from the debris scatter, although there is little in the way of raw material, such as quarry blanks or stacks of cobbles selected for reduction. The implication is that only a few sources of stone near the camp have been used, and the resulting scatter of debitage and broken bifaces is the result of one individual, or at most a few individuals, working here over a relatively short period of time. The scatter of workshop debris around the hearth indicates a small short-term camp, perhaps of only a few days' duration. During that time, raw material was processed into bifacial tool forms and expedient tools were quickly prepared, and discarded after use. Among the expedient tools is a jasper split-cobble scraper. Evidence of cooking and food preparation is also limited, with only a few ceramic vessels represented.

Based on this scatter of debris, one could envision a more broadly scattered series of activities centering on raw material testing, mostly in cobble form, and initial reduction that ultimately resulted in the scatter of jasper early reduction flakes. Nearer to the hearth, the work of a single individual producing bifaces appears to be evident in a tightly concentrated cluster of biface reduction flakes. Closer examination of the cluster shows that the individual was working both chert and jasper.

Looking to the left and further up the hill, another lithic workshop area is seen (Block Area 2). Late-stage biface fragments amid clusters of jasper and quartzite biface reduction flakes mark the location. Single and scattered discarded tools, such as a chert biface close to the debris piles, may indicate the replacement of these items by newly manufactured tools. Not only bifaces, but expedient flake tools as well, are evident in this workshop area. The flake tools clearly mark the ad hoc nature of the workshop, as the tools appear to have been prepared for single, or, at most, short-term use before being cast aside. The very crude cores, which are little more than modified blocks of shatter, also indicate the expedient character of this workshop.

The debris itself is dominated by jasper and quartzite, both of which are available locally in cobble form, although no systematic effort to acquire cobbles and cache them on the site is apparent. It is

likely that most of the cobble testing was accomplished off-site and only a few select cobbles were actually brought back to the site for tool production purposes.

The fact that early reduction areas are overlaid with more focused biface reduction areas suggests that relatively few individuals, or even a single individual, was carrying out all the necessary steps in bifacial tool production, using the available raw materials. A more complex and long-term occupation would have involved more specialized or distinctive tasks, such as producing early- or middle-stage biface preforms, formal tools, and more elaborate core forms, and all of these tasks would have been conducted in specific areas of the site. This does not appear to have been the case at the Drawyer Creek South Site.

A short distance downslope from the workshop just described, a small hearth (Feature 5, dating to AD 1290 to 1425) is apparent, also associated with a small lithic workshop area. Here too, the raw materials used are the locally available jasper, quartzite, and chert, and again much of the material is in cobble form. A quartz core fragment lying nearby indicates the use of other local raw materials as well, much of which was probably obtained from area creek beds and cobble-rich stream and river terraces.

A short distance (10 meters) away, another lithic workshop is evident. It is dominated by jasper bifaces and cores and associated with a few Woodland II ceramic sherds from a single vessel. Like the workshops in the areas of the site already described, this workshop is represented by debris from staged biface reduction activities and the production of flake tools from expedient cores. A sandstone hammerstone lying within the concentration of jasper flake debris was probably used for early-stage biface reduction and perhaps also for striking flakes from the blocky jasper cores. In this location, jasper appears to have been the main raw material used. Two small areas within this broad scatter of early reduction debris contain concentrations of late-stage biface reduction debris, perhaps the result of the work of one or two individuals.

A short distance (2 meters) downslope from this jasper workshop area, there is evidence of another workshop area (Block Area 3 Center). Here quartzite is the primary raw material worked. Tool and debris forms are comparable to those in the adjacent jasper workshop, with staged quartzite bifaces and cores primarily represented. Nearby, a cluster of FCR representing a small hearth, and a single fire-reddened core, are evident. The hearth appears to have been a focal point for workshop activities, as may be seen from the staged bifaces and cores lying to its south and west. One of the quartzite cores lying nearby, a small tested cobble, characterizes the focus of this workshop, and most of the other workshop locations. They are multi-stage lithic workshop areas where cobble gathering, testing, and splitting, and biface production from early through late stages, were undertaken. Some of the broken bifaces evident among the lithic debris area were most likely discarded during the course of this hearthside tool-making session.

Additional broken or flawed bifaces, principally of quartzite, lie further from the hearth, along with a few cores and the base of a jasper projectile point. From the quartzite debitage focused in the hearth area, it is clear that the predominant debris is the result of early reduction activities. High rates of rejection of partially manufactured early- and middle-stage bifaces would account for the broader concentrations of early reduction debris. As in the other workshop areas, late-stage biface

reduction areas are more concentrated and are identifiable as individual work stations. More focused late-stage work would account for the tighter clusters of late-stage biface reduction debris.

A short distance away from this workshop (Block Area 3 East), and closer to the creek bank, another small scatter of Woodland II artifacts may be seen. This appears to be a more marginal scatter, consisting of both ceramic and lithic debris that may have been swept from an activity area on the bank edge, or from the workshop just described. No workshop area is evident here, at least not one as large as in the localities further up the slope.

Facing upslope and to the far left, little remains of Woodland II occupations except for a small hearth which is further upslope than any of the others described. This part of the site appears to have seen little use.

Overall, the site appears to have been used by Woodland II groups not only during a single episode, but on several occasions. This would have been apparent shortly after the final abandonment of the site from the different rates of vegetation regrowth in and around hearth areas, within food processing areas, and in areas of lithic debris scatters.

While some of the debris from the various workshops appears to relate to the exploitation and use of similar raw material sources, other clusters of debris are probably the remains of several very short-term visits to the site. Such visits would most likely have occurred during travel along the creek in the course of hunting, fishing, foraging, or other resource collecting. Thus the site would simply have been a staging area or an intermittent camp of short duration, occupied for convenience. Within the settlement typology developed by Custer (1994) for Woodland I, and also appropriate in many respects for Woodland II, this site would be classed as a transient camp.

## C. REGIONAL THEMES

Specific themes developed for the region's prehistory are considered in the discussions below, as they have been in the preceding chapters. Some of the data retrieved from the site are obviously insufficient to address certain themes. However, the process of information gathering for theme development is viewed as a cumulative one. Preliminary implications of the data presented in this study and data derived from related archaeological investigations can be utilized together to more accurately interpret the prehistory of Delaware, and on a broader level, the prehistory of the Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain. The key themes addressed in this report, and integrated into the discussions of the site occupations, are chronology or sequence, subsistence, settlement patterns, technology, and environmental adaptation.

### *1. Chronology*

The Phase III investigations have provided additional data relevant to the northern Delaware ceramic chronology. The ceramic assemblage from the site spans the entire range of the Woodland period, beginning with Marcey Creek and Dames Quarter (1000 to 100 BC), Wolfe Neck (400 BC), and Hell Island (AD 600 to 800), to the later Riggins series and Minguannan wares and their variants (AD 1000-1500). The Minguannan ceramics recovered from the site include several highly decorated vessel fragments that might initially be classified as Minguannan Compound decorated.

It should also be noted, however, that similar decorative elements are present on contemporaneous Indian Head and Riggins ceramics of southern New Jersey (Cross 1941), directly across the Delaware River from the Drawyer Creek/ Appoquinimink River drainage. Further analysis of southern New Jersey assemblages may show clearer affinities with the Drawyer Creek South Site assemblage and other Minguannan-like ceramic assemblages. This is clearly a subject that needs further examination through collections analyses.

The less elaborate Riggins variants recovered from the site, although difficult to place in time and regional space, have, at the least, contributed additional samples to the regional data base for Late Woodland ceramics. More subtle variations in temper and surface treatment, as well as decoration, still need to be clarified for the southern New Jersey-northern Delaware region. Similar wares from more distant sources in the Chesapeake Bay and Delaware River drainage area also need to be defined more clearly.

The earlier ceramic wares recovered from the Drawyer Creek South Site may not have contributed greatly to the refinement of the regional chronology, but they have provided further documentation for the sequence of occupations represented at this site. The sequence of ceramic wares, including Marcey Creek, Dames Quarter, Wolfe Neck, and Hell Island, has provided markers for the series of small intermittent visits to the site over a period of 1,500 years.

The same may be said with respect to projectile point styles represented on the site. The various points recovered include styles typical of the region from initial Woodland I to Woodland II. The contexts in which several of these points were recovered were rather ambiguous, owing to the compressed nature of the site stratigraphy, but some comparisons to regional stylistic trends can be made on a more general level. For example, the tear drop forms common in southern New Jersey assemblages are also represented at the Drawyer Creek South Site (Cat. No. 403; see Plate 7a), and the raw material of choice for these points, argillite, also corresponds to a common trend in raw material selection in southern New Jersey. The most recently obtained dates for tear drop points from sites such as 28GL15 and 28GL148 in southern New Jersey (1480-220 BC) (Mounier and Martin 1994) match the earliest occupations at the Drawyer Creek South Site.

The several lanceolate point fragments recovered may represent stages in the manufacture of Fox Creek lanceolate points. Lanceolate projectile points are a common form on the Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain. The specimens from the Drawyer Creek South Site are not unique in any way, but they do suggest another manufacturing site for these forms, and can provide useful comparative data for more substantial Fox Creek components in Delaware and the surrounding region. Further examination of these points within the context of a manufacturing sequence may have provide important information regarding the manufacture of similar points on other sites.

## *2. Lithic Technology*

The technology represented on the site for both the upper and the lower component is expedient in nature. This applies principally to non-bifacial forms such as unifaces and cores. In the upper component, or Woodland II occupation of the site, for example, the unifaces consisted of flake tool forms that were minimally modified. The only shaping applied to these tool forms was focused on the edges. In other words, no stylistic features were applied to the tools prior to edge work. Some

unifaces, such as the jasper example (Cat. No. 82) illustrated in Plate 12e, were made from split cobbles. This specimen is a simple split cobble on which minimal edge work has been undertaken to prepare the steep-angled edge suitable for scraper use. This type of technology fits the Middle and Late Woodland cobble-based expedient technology described by Stewart (1987) for the Delaware Valley.

The core forms recovered from the Drawyer Creek South Site are also examples of minimally prepared blocks of raw material that were used to produce only a few flakes before being discarded. As discussed in Chapter VI, no true prepared cores of any kind were recovered from the site. The freehand, bipolar, bifacial, and tested cobble types of cores described for the site assemblage simply represent the different ways that flakes were produced from cobbles or larger blocks of outcrop material. These minimally prepared core forms were either struck by hand bifacially (bifacial core) or in a multidirectional manner (freehand), or the block/cobble was placed on the ground and struck (bipolar) to produce suitable flakes for manufacturing flake tools. There is little consistency to these forms other than the direction and orientation of the flake scars.

By comparison, the micro-cores commonly found on the New Jersey Coastal Plain and at Abbott Farm have a consistency of form that can be recognized within a site assemblage and from one site to the next. The byproducts of such cores are also recognizable—for example, the characteristic blade-like flakes described by Stewart (1987, 1989). There is no such consistency in the Drawyer Creek South Site assemblages, which would seem to indicate that minimal time and effort was invested in non-bifacial tool manufacturing at the site. Raw material preferences were focused on locally available cobbles, particularly quartzite and jasper. Some jasper outcrop material is also represented, most likely obtained from the Iron Hill area near the edge of the Piedmont.

The more formalized core forms found at Abbott Farm may be the result of the quarrying process. That is, variation in raw material quality may have dictated the use of a consistent and formal bipolar reduction process to test for raw material quality. Such a process may also have been necessary during times of raw material scarcity. During raw material acquisition and testing, formal core production may have been undertaken, with suitable cores transported back to the base camp. At Drawyer Creek South, where high-quality raw materials may have been more abundant, less formalized reduction processes would be expected. The result is more shatter forms and fewer recognizable core forms.

Analysis of stone tools associated with the site occupations showed little more than evidence of primary workshop activities directed toward bifacial tool reduction and flake tool manufacturing. Some of the debitage was probably utilized for limited processing of plant and animal resources collected from the vicinity of the site; no formal toolkit clearly associated with such tasks was recovered. The projectile points indicate that hunting tasks were conducted, but examination of the points and other bifaces in the collection produced no clear evidence of the systematic use of these implements for cutting and scraping purposes. The only tools that showed consistent use-wear were the expedient scrapers and utilized flakes, which were probably manufactured on the spot for a specific purpose and then discarded when the task was completed.

The implications of these data with respect to the lithic technology theme in general include several considerations relevant to future directions in lithic analysis as noted by Custer (1994:174-175).

More detailed studies should be undertaken that consider the use of nonlocal raw materials (e.g., rhyolite) and the use of cobble versus primary sources. Studies on the latter topic should include detailed analyses of cortex as represented in site assemblages. Although most studies already take this issue into account, the data need to be incorporated into settlement theme analyses as well. Questions to be considered include the following: Were cobble sources more consistently used on certain types of sites, and if so, why? How does this use relate to the curation of the more exotic raw materials and the exploitation of outcrop sources above the fall line? Were any of these materials being carried from site to site as source material for expedient tools, or were the cobble sources available in most localities suitable for such purposes? The patterns discerned might also be compared to what has been observed in the Lower Delaware Valley of New Jersey and in the Maryland and Virginia Coastal Plain.

### *3. Settlement Patterns and Subsistence Practices*

Probably one of the most common site types representing any period in the Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain is the transient camp or station, which would have been utilized for the collection and processing of a variety of resources. This observation is clearly reflected in the site distribution data for the region. Such sites, normally represented by projectile point finds, expedient tools, and small scatters of debitage, would perhaps have been linked to nearby base camps or staging areas some distance away, depending, of course, on the type of resource being exploited. Specialized procurement sites in the uplands should contain relatively high frequencies of projectile points and bifacial tools, as well perhaps as nutting stones and cobble tools that would be characteristic of a hunting and gathering tool assemblage. These assemblages may be compared to assemblages from the larger floodplain/ estuarine settings, where shellfish exploitation and a greater variety of procurement and base camp activities would be reflected in a more diversified toolkit.

The very limited quantity of food-grinding/processing equipment found at the Drawyer Creek South Site and the sparse botanical evidence (e.g., hickory, walnut, mulberry, and grape) indicate that some collecting was accomplished in the vicinity of the site, perhaps for consumption over the short term. No intensive exploitation is suggested by the data. The lack of storage features on the site also documents a more transitory, and possibly broad-spectrum, adaptation, where hunting and the limited gathering of selected plants were practiced. It has been mentioned for other regions of the Eastern Woodlands (Stafford 1991, 1994) that during the Late Archaic, nut masts, especially hickory, were intensively exploited, and extractive camps were most likely established where high yields were available. It has also been observed (Asch et al. 1972:29) that for small populations dependent on wild foods, concentration on the procurement of hickory nuts is more efficient than exploitation of other wild plant food sources.

Thus, aside from the preservation factor, the relative ease of procuring nuts may partially account for the ubiquitous presence of hickory nuts in archaeological contexts. After having been gathered in the vicinity of small sites such as Drawyer Creek South (if nut gathering did in fact occur there), the mast may have been transported to larger base camps, perhaps in estuarine locations, for further processing. If nuts were stored at Drawyer Creek South, they may have been placed in portable skin or bark containers, or in ceramic vessels. This may have been the more feasible alternative to the use of pits for storage. Storage pits may have been more characteristic of longer-term occupations. Nut harvests may also have been exploited during upland forays undertaken for other purposes, e.g.,

for hunting or lithic raw material procurement. The Drawyer Creek South Site may not have been a high-yield area for mast, although some exploitation of a nut mast resource is implied in the recovered botanical remains.

One can also make broader comparisons of subsistence/settlement systems with other Eastern Woodlands regions, such as the American Bottom (Yerkes 1986). In that region, efficient seasonal rounds are expressed in the range of site types represented and in the variability in feature density within those site types. This pattern is not unlike that originally described by Winters (1969) for the Riverton culture, and may have some applicability to the Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain and its complex system of estuarine/riverine/upland landscapes. In the Coastal Plain, efficiency of resource exploitation may be observed in upland versus estuarine and riverine occupations. The clear absence of pit features and the low artifact density at the Drawyer Creek South Site indicate a transient occupation. This transient mode may fit into a more complex cycle of seasonal resource exploitation. However, it is the larger base camp or the macroband/microband camps that would contain more tangible evidence of patterns, such as increased sedentism, seasonal changes in resource use, and changes in community patterns and other cultural patterns expressed in the archaeological record.

The smaller transient camps such as the Drawyer Creek South Site are likely to show little change in assemblage character through time, except for stylistic changes and fluctuations in the intensity of the various short-term occupations. Most of the occupations will show hearth-focused occupations marked by limited workshop debris and even more limited evidence of subsistence practices. For example, although the Drawyer Creek South Site is within an estuarine setting, no evidence of the exploitation of estuarine resources is provided by the archaeological findings. Preservation may be a factor in minimizing organic evidence (e.g., shellfish), but it is likely that Drawyer Creek was being used principally as a means of transport by watercraft. Selection of the site as a short-term camp would therefore have been based on more superficial attributes, such as drainage and slope and suitability for a brief visit. The same basis for site selection could conceivably apply to all of the site occupations, which more than likely represent incidental residences of a short-term nature during the course of hunting/fishing/foraging trips in more productive settings some distance away. One could say that it is these more distant productive estuarine-riverine settings that would have contained most of the larger and more complex base camps.

This interpretation of the Drawyer Creek South Site seems to tie into Custer's (1994) settlement typology for Woodland I, and may also apply to the basic Woodland II settlement system for northern Delaware (e.g., Minguannan). Within a simplified six-class site typology that includes (1) macroband camps, (2) microband camps, (3) transient camps, (4) procurement/processing sites, (5) quarry-related sites, and (6) mortuary-related sites, the Drawyer Creek South Site appears to fit best into the transient site class. By definition (Custer 1994:155), such sites of limited size contain a moderate number of tool types, a moderate number of artifacts, and very few features. These sites could have served as stopping points during movements between any of the other site types, and, consequently, this type of site should be the most numerous in the archaeological record. The difference between Woodland I and Woodland II times as represented on such sites is more than likely an increase in the intensity of occupation during Woodland II times, a pattern which is clearly apparent at the Drawyer Creek South Site.

As Custer (1986:142) has noted, there seems to have been no development of Woodland II villages in northern Delaware comparable to the development that occurred in the regions surrounding Delaware. This difference is attributed to the continued focus of Woodland II groups in the region on the rich estuarine areas that contained predictable and reliable subsistence resources. Intensive horticultural practices in these estuarine areas may have been marginalized—pursued only as a means of acquiring supplemental food resources. Certainly, the innovations in food production would not have been completely rejected even in areas containing rich abundances of wild foods. However, evidence of such resources would be poorly represented in the archaeological record, although not completely absent from it.

It is suggested that better, or more comprehensive, sampling methods should be applied during the excavation of the larger Woodland II camps in order to determine the degree of dependence on wild versus domesticated food resources. If there was, in fact, little or no need for the cultivation of domesticated plants, such as maize, beans, squash, and sunflower, then there must have been relatively sophisticated means of acquiring wild food resources during their cycles of availability. These cycles should factor into settlement systems observable in the archaeological record, and the kinds of data acquired from these sites by flotation and other means (e.g., plant residue analyses) should begin to show differences from site to site. These differences might not be as apparent at transient camps such as Drawyer Creek South, where much of the food residues left behind in the archaeological record were probably transported materials originating elsewhere. However, more detailed analyses of the transient site assemblages compared to assemblages from the macroband and microband camps might lead to a more comprehensive view of wild food acquisition, consumption, and redistribution within the settlement system.

#### D. FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, recovery methods used in the investigation of sites such as Drawyer Creek South can be improved. The application of piece plotting or a suitable alternative (50-cm blocks), for example, is an important means of recovering information. The use of a smaller mesh for screening (e.g., 1/8-inch mesh) to recover the more minute occupational debris will also sometimes provide supplementary information that is a key to interpreting a site, and the use of finer screening material should not be a problem in coarse-textured sediments such as those found on the Delaware Coastal Plain. It is clear that certain exotic lithic raw materials were preferred at different times in prehistory. Isolating these exotic material clusters may provide useful information on time-specific activity areas. The microdebitage retrieved from smaller mesh screens may show the edges of such clusters (both horizontally and stratigraphically) more sharply, since much of the microdebitage that would ordinarily be missed in 1/8-inch mesh samples may be a result of the resharpening of curated items made of nonlocal raw material. The use of small-screen samples on single and multicomponent occupations has already been successfully applied in other locations (see Beld 1991; Wall 1981).

Finally, the application of procedures such as blood residue analysis, in spite of some serious methodological problems, has produced interesting results that have contributed to site interpretations. For example, recent analysis of residues on lithic artifacts from two sites (36Co17 and 36Co18) in the North Branch of the Susquehanna River Valley has shown the presence of protein residues identified as several species of fish (e.g., gizzard shad, American eel, trout, and

catfish) (Jacoby et al. 1996). This finding implies use of the site as a fishing station, where fish were caught and processed on-site.

The identification of plant residues through new experimental methods shows some promise, but published results are scarce (Carbone and Keel 1985). Among these methods are gas chromatography and gas chromatography/mass spectrometry, both of which are used to detect trace residues such as lipids (fatty substances) which bond to the surface layers of pottery sherds during food processing (Evershed et al. 1991). At the present time, the separation of components and the isolation of key features and artifact clusters are difficult research problems, approached principally through stratigraphic means or by distinguishing horizontally discrete manifestations. It is hoped that future application of residue analysis will provide artifact-specific information that will contribute to the interpretation of activity areas within a site. Refinements of these analytical techniques and the development of new forms of analysis designed to retrieve data from artifacts rather than contexts will increase the interpretive quality of data retrieved from sites with shallow stratigraphy or mixed stratigraphy.

It is still necessary to look at small transient camps as essential links within a broader network of settlement types. These smaller sites, with their more clearly defined activity areas, have the potential to contribute significant information to our understanding of Woodland period settlement patterns overall. The assemblages and the samples collected from earlier efforts at such sites should also remain under study, so that data that were overlooked during the earlier work, or that were unavailable because of the less precise analytical methods used, can be retrieved. Collections of this type are often neglected or are too casually skimmed for data in favor of excavating new sites using the more precise and focused sampling methods available. The existing data base of site information should not be undervalued. Information obtained from earlier work at small transient camps, combined with new data from the larger macroband and microband camps, should ultimately provide a clearer view of development and diversification within the Woodland II period of northern Delaware.